



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,993	11/12/2001	Gerard Alan Lynch	20228-300501	6492

37509 7590 04/06/2004

DECHERT LLP
P.O. BOX 10004
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/010,993

Applicant(s)

LYNCH GERARD

Examiner

CUONG H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3625

MLJ

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication received on 8/27/2003 (the change of address paper).

Status of the Claims

2. Claims **1- 10** are pending in this application.

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with informal drawings (9 Figures) which currently are acceptable for examining purposes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pat. 6,427,140), in view of Nakano et al. (US Pat. 5,745,109).

A. As to claim 1: Ginter et al. teach a method of delivering items (see **Ginter**, Fig.2), comprising:

- receiving, a request from client browser for a program (see Ginter, Fig.2, a user (112) requests to VDE administrator (116)); and
delivering the program to the requesting client browser (see **Ginter**,

Fig.2, ref. 108), the program being configured to receive seller specific information (this is non-functional descriptive material; therefore, this specific information is obvious in a step of receiving a program in Ginter's patent), and to load and activate a module including a picture displaying module for displaying selectable images, the picture displaying module being configured to moveably display - see also **Nakano** et al., 4:10-18), or **Ginter** et al., in the Detailed Description Text (para. 856): "Other modifications of an image (or moving image, audio, etc.) which provide a similar benefit (that is, storing information in a form that is not normally noticeable as a result of a certain modification of the source information) may be appropriate, depending on the application. For example, certain subtle modifications in the frequency of stored audio information can be modified so as to be normally unnoticeable to the listener while still being readable with the proper tools.", or **Ginter** et al., in the Detailed Description Text (para. 1220): "The content of an object 300 created by an author may be generated with the assistance of a VDE aware application program or a non-VDE aware application program. The content of the object created by an author in conjunction with such programs may include text, formatted text, pictures, moving pictures, sounds, computer software, multimedia, electronic games, electronic training materials, various types of files, and so on, without limitation", and "to redirect" action of **Ginter** et al., in the Detailed Description Text (para. 170):

"FIG. 10 is a block diagram of one example of a software structure/architecture for Rights Operating System ("ROS") 602 provided by the preferred embodiment. In this example, ROS 602 includes an operating system ("OS") "core" 679, a user Application Program Interface ("API") 682, a "redirector" 684, an "intercept" 692, a User Notification/Exception Interface 686, and a file system 687. ROS 602 in this example also includes one or more Host Event

Processing Environments ("HPEs") 655 and/or one or more Secure Event Processing Environments ("SPEs") 503 (these environments may be generically referred to as "Protected Processing Environments" 650)." , or **Ginter et al.**, in the Detailed Description Text (para. 188): "Since the second advantage (reducing complexity) makes it easier for an application creator to produce applications, even "VDE aware" applications 608a(2) may be designed so that some calls invoking VDE functions 604 are requested at the level of an "other OS functions" call and then "translated" by redirector 684 into a VDE function call (in this sense, redirector 684 may be considered a part of API 682). FIG. 11C shows an example of this. Other calls invoking VDE functions 604 may be passed directly without translation by redirector 684."

- Nakano et al. also teach to browse an item/document associated with a selected image (see Nakano et al., Fig.7, ref. 113 – "GAME ARCADE").

Although both Ginter et al. and Nakano et al. do not disclose the claimed steps in an auction environment; it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Ginter et al. and Nakano to suggest those ideas to be used in an auction environment, because an auction environment is belongs to intention of use, this does not effect the steps of delivering images to a browser at all; artisan would recognize that these steps help to organize a server that implementing Internet ordering claimed specific method of selecting and ordering products.

B. As to claims 2-3: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

- Ginter et al. /Nakano et al. also teach a step of receiving a request about an item description (see **Ginter**, Fig.2, a user (112) requests a VDE content from VDE administrator (116)).

- The motivation of obviousness is similar to claim 1 (please note that “an auction site” is a non-functional description material that do not effect a step of receiving something from somewhere.

C. As to claims 6,8: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

Nakano also teaches that a program is configured to load and activate a item links module that maintains a set of item links for a category in the set of categories available on a site (see Nakano, Fig.5 – “PHONE” in ref. 112 is selected to perform claimed functions).

D. As to claims 7, 9: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 6 are incorporated.

It is obvious that Nakano et al. would teach that a set of item links available on a site is stored from an auxiliary server because of making separated or integrate together different servers are obvious in the field of computer networking (see Nakano, Fig.12) - storing an item from a remote place (an auxiliary server) or storing it on site is not an inventive concept because it would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice - In re Fridolph, 50 CCPA 745, 89 F.2d 509, 135 USPQ 319, In re Lockhart, 90 USPQ 214 (CCPA 1951).

E. As to claim 10: The rationales and references for rejection of claim 9 are incorporated.

Nakano et al. teach that an item link includes a related name (see Nakano, Fig.12 "KID'S LAND").

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pat. 6,427,140), in view of Nakano et al. (US Pat. 5,745,109), and further in view of Kiesel (US Pat. 4,949,193).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

- Ginter et al. and Nakano et al. also teach a step of displaying a picture at different speed.

- However, Kiesel teaches that characterization (see Kiesel, 10:28-33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Ginter et al.**, **Nakano et al.**, and Kiesel to suggest a step of displaying a picture at different speed (e.g., moveably display pictures at a controllable speed; and wherein the controllable speed is set by a pointing device connected to the client computer system) because Kiesel contributes to a controllable speed that making a system suggested by Ginter et al. and Nakano et al. more flexible.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter et al. (US Pat. 6,427,140), in view of Nakano et al. (US Pat. 5,745,109), and further in view of Izumi et al. (US Pat. 6,157,410).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

- Ginter et al. and Nakano et al. do not expressly disclose that moving images are displayed horizontally in a computer's window.

However, Izumi et al. teach that moving images are displayed horizontally in a computer's window (see Izumi et al., the abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Ginter et al.**, **Nakano et al.**, and Izumi et al. to suggest a step of moving images are displayed horizontally in a computer's window because moving images horizontally (from left to right directions) or vertically (from top to bottom directions) have already been a habit to a viewer to follow an ordered pattern.

Conclusion

7. Claims **1- 10** are not patentable.

8. Note: A move-able image/picture has been taught in bill-board advertisement.

- Please note that claiming an "auction item" is obvious for a general item because that is a non-functional descriptive material that does not contribute to the claimed method of delivering images.

- US Pat 6,400,996 also suggests about "movable images" "Detailed Description Text (302):

Image Analysis

Detailed Description Text (303):

Alternatively to the object extraction, the image as a whole may be analyzed. In the case of moving images, the aforementioned method is further modified to accommodate time varying images. These images usually vary by small amounts between frames, and this allows a statistical improvement of the recognition function by compensating for a movement vector, as well as any other transformation of the image. This also allows a minimization of the processing

necessary because redundant information between successive frames is not subject to the full degree of processing. Of course, if the image is substantially changed, then the statistical processing ceases, and a new recognition function may be begun, "flushing" the system of the old values. The basic method is thus modified by storing delayed image data information, i.e., a subsequent frame of a moving image. This represents an image of a moving object differing in time from the image data in the data processor."

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose number is 703-305-4553. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, JEFFREY A. SMITH can be reached on 703-308-3588. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-7687.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Please provide support, with page and line numbers, for any amended or new claim in an effort to help advance prosecution; otherwise any new claim language that is introduced in an amended or new claim may be considered as new matter, especially if the Application is a Jumbo Application.

Cuong H. Nguyen

CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3625